THE MIZAN NEWSLETTER

Vol.II No.9 October 1960

The Mizan Newsletter aims at giving an objective and balanced account of current Soviet writings on the Middle East

---

The USSR and the Neutrals: The Bases for Accord is an account of a notable PRAVDA article by Academician Ye. Zhukov restating the ideological bases for Soviet solidarity with "bourgeois" states of Asia and Africa, in the common "struggle against imperialism". Taking issue with both Western "propagandists" and Communist "dogmatists", Zhukov denies that the Soviet Union aims, or ought to aim, at revolution in these countries; their eventual "socialist transformation", he says, will come in due course.

MIDDLE EAST

Current Soviet Views on Middle East Oil surveys recent Soviet writing on such issues as the coordination of oil policies of the producer countries, the terms of new agreements with independent companies, Sahara oil and the growing involvement of the Soviet Union in Middle East oil affairs.

The Middle East in the Soviet Press includes a PRAVDA comment on the closing down of the Iraqi Communist newspaper ITTIHAD ASH-SHA'B.

AFRICA

Soviet Writing on Guinea examines the Soviet attitude to the social, economic and political aspects of the "Guinean experiment" - the creation of a non-capitalist "democratic system" which, in Sekou Toure's words, "has not been copied from either the European or Asian countries".

The Africa section also includes a correspondent's comments on L.A. Fadeyev's article on Zimbabwe, which was reviewed in the last issue of the Newsletter.

Africa in the Soviet Press is a survey of Soviet reports and comments on the Congo events covering the period 22nd September - 11th October, and of reports and comment on other African affairs covering the period 11th July - 11th October.

THE USSR AND THE NEUTRALS: THE BASES FOR ACCORD

The Marxist-Leninist justification for the rapprochement between the Soviet Union and the capitalist or "bourgeois" states of under-developed countries has been frequently restated since the XXth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in February 1956, at which the necessary readjustment of the Party line received formal confirmation. A new and authoritative restatement of the Soviet position in this matter has now appeared in an article by Academician Ye. Zhukov in PRAVDA of 26th August 1960. The occasion and reason for this are apparent from the substance of Zhukov's own pronouncements: in the first place, the emergence of many new African states and the "progressive development" of other longer established states; in the second place, the opposition to the policy of peaceful co-existence and support for non-socialist states which, according to Zhukov, is being voiced by "dogmatists" and "sectarians" who hold no brief for anything short of proletarian revolution. Whether this opposition is to be attributed to elements inside the Soviet Union or outside it (in China, for example) is a matter for speculation; the significant fact is that it has been thought necessary to reaffirm and re-define the extent (and limitations) of Soviet ideological solidarity with non-socialist states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, on the basis of a common struggle for peace and against colonialism. At the same time Zhukov's article suggests that a corresponding ideological solidarity of these states with the Soviet Union is looked for.

Peaceful co-existence and common front tactics Zhukov recalls that the XXth and XXIst CPSU Congresses consistently put forward the Leninist thesis of the peaceful co-existence of states with different social and economic systems; expressed support for the peoples' national liberation struggle against colonialism, and friendship with the newly independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America; and "rejected dogmatic notions that the national bourgeoisie of colonial and dependent countries has everywhere and always turned into a reactionary force, unable to participate, let alone to play a leading role, in the anti-imperialist struggle".

On the subject of peaceful co-existence, Zhukov condemns as "profoundly erroneous" the views of "dogmatists and sectarians" who "not understanding the laws of social development, assert that implementation of the Leninist principle of peaceful co-existence retards the development of the national liberation movement and dooms it to stagnation". On the contrary, the example set by the development of the USSR and the other socialist countries, their active support for a policy of peace and their unselfish aid to under-developed countries inspire the peoples of these countries with confidence in "the success of their just cause". On the basic question of war and peace the position of the non-socialist Eastern states and of the socialist states coincide, as is shown by the

support of India, Indonesia and many others for the Soviet disarmament proposals. These national states have come into being as part of the historical process of self-determination whose importance Lenin himself emphasized. "Only petty-bourgeois Leftists and hopeless dogmatists can deny the great historic significance of the fact of the formation of national states in Asia and Africa, even though many of these states have not yet attained economic independence and have not solved a number of pressing social problems advanced by life."

On the respective roles of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in independence movements, Zhukov remarks that most national states of Asia and Africa have a nationalist regime under bourgeois leadership; "but this cannot diminish the importance of the break-through in the imperialist front." The working class, it is true, is the most consistent enemy of imperialism; but "Lenin considered it natural that at the beginning of every national movement the bourgeoisie should come forward as its leader and in the struggle for national self-determination should call for support for the most revolutionary elements of the bourgeois-democratic national liberation movements". Zhukov goes on:

> "Doctrinaires and 'leftists' who permit themselves to sneer at such forms of the national liberation movement as do not fit into the customary sociological schemes forget that 'pure' revolutionary processes do not exist in nature. It is natural that in the anti-imperialist liberation movement the front of participants is much wider than in a social revolution... Failure to understand its multiplicity, and a haughty attitude towards anti-imperialist actions when, in defined historical conditions, non-proletarian elements come to the forefront, represents sectarianism of a most dangerous kind leading to self-isolation."

Since different countries are at different stages of development, and since it is impossible to skip over an entire historical stage, socialist transformation cannot be mechanically and simultaneously applied in all countries. For many backward countries just liberated from imperialism, countries where the peasants form the main mass of the population, the central task for a long time will be struggle not against capital but against the vestiges of feudalism. Consequently a long period of cooperation between workers, peasants, intelligentsia and the progressive bourgeoisie is necessary.

At this point Zhukov speaks of the role of the Communists: "The Communists of these countries come forward as selfless fighters for the interests of their peoples; they are an active patriotic force, and it is no accident that therefore they enjoy well-deserved respect in their countries." The inference plainly is that the Communists should join, and should be accepted in, the common front of other "patriotic" elements.

Progressive change or revolution? The tasks to be undertaken by the forces thus united, Zhukov goes on, include agrarian reform, the creation of a national industry, the abrogation of enslaving agreements, and a foreign policy of peace and non-participation in military blocs. But this does not mean that the question of transition to a non-capitalist road of development is indefinitely postponed; after the solution of initial national problems other social questions, such as the struggle between labour and capital, will give rise, in Khrushchev's words, to "different opinions on the methods of the further development of these States".

Zhukov observes that the superiority of socialism over capitalism is shown by the fact that many organizations and leaders in Asian and African countries profess themselves adherents of socialism. It is impossible to describe as socialist those "measures of a general democratic character" which have been taken in India, the UAR, Iraq and other Asian and African countries; but it would be wrong to underestimate their progressive character, and to adopt a dogmatic and slighting attitude towards them.

Zhukov complains that attempts have been made by imperialist propaganda to allege that states which have close contacts with the USSR are exposing themselves to a "Communist danger". The aim of this is to sow discord between such states and the USSR. In fact, the USSR only desires friendly and mutually profitable peaceful cooperation, which will strengthen the economies of such states as the UAR and Afghanistan and thereby their political independence from imperialism, "although, as is well known, they are not socialist countries". Zhukov declares:

> "Marxism-Leninism resolutely condemns as a reactionary Utopia the very possibility of the 'export' of revolution to other countries, and rejects any imposition on other countries of social systems and institutions which are not the product of internal development."

Zhukov concludes his article by reaffirming the solidarity of the Soviet Union with the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America on the basis of, firstly, a policy of peace and struggle against "militarism, the brother of colonialism", and, secondly, struggle against colonialism.

Zhukov's article is yet another example of the elaborate argumentation necessary to reconcile Soviet policy with ideological fundamentals. But the essentials of Zhukov's theme are simple enough. For the furtherance of its own "anti-imperialist" policy the Soviet Union seeks the friendship and alliance of the "uncommitted" countries, despite ideological differences with their Governments, on an "anti-imperialist" basis. Communists who oppose this on ideological grounds are told that "socialist transformation" of the countries in question will come in due

course, and will come all the sooner when the initial national problems of these countries are solved, with Soviet assistance.

It might of course be maintained that the latter argument is only an ideological pretext, and that the aims of Soviet policy would be satisfied if the initial stages of the Soviet plan were achieved. But since, by Zhukov's own account, a body of Communist opinion holds to the more radical ideal of "pure revolution", it is legitimate to assume that the more moderate aim of eventual "socialist transformation" will at any rate remain on the agenda.

CURRENT SOVIET VIEWS ON MIDDLE EAST OIL

Until recently, Soviet writing on the subject of Middle East oil concentrated on the theme of alleged Western enrichment at the expense of the Middle East peoples. There were only two sides in this picture - that of the "oil monopolies" with the Western Governments behind them, and that of the Middle East peoples allegedly robbed of their country's wealth and exploited as cheap labour by the oil companies. The part played by the Middle East Governments was little discussed; they were represented as either willing collaborators or passive victims of the "monopolies", making no attempt to defend their peoples' interests except under extreme pressure from the latter. Even Mosaddeq's Government was not given all the credit that might have been expected for its nationalization measures; it was condemned as representing a short-sighted attempt by the Persian bourgeoisie to gain control of Persian oil for its own ends (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.6 of 1959, p.7). The notion of a Middle East Government pursuing a national oil policy with genuine popular support could not have fitted into this Soviet picture.

During the last three years, however, there has been a growing Soviet realization of the need to recognize that, in their oil policies, Middle East Governments are taking national, popular and even "progressive" aspirations into account. Indeed, there has been an increasing Soviet tendency to make propaganda capital out of this trend. Initiatives by Middle East Governments to obtain better terms from existing oil concessionaries, to make more favourable agreements with new entrants into the field, and to form national oil undertakings of various kinds; the oil policy adopted by Iraq's revolutionary Government - a Government for whose measures Soviet approval is usually a foregone conclusion; moves by the Governments of Middle East and other oil-producing countries to formulate a joint oil policy; French exploitation of Sahara oil, and its possible consequences for Middle East oil producers; and the involvement of the Soviet Union itself in Middle East oil affairs, both through its own entry into the world oil market and through its assistance to the national oil industries of Iraq and the UAR; all these developments have resulted in closer Soviet attention to the actual oil policies of Middle East Governments, as being the effective instrument of national aspirations.

Joint initiatives by Middle East Governments Although Arab League initiatives for the coordination of the oil policies of the Arab countries had been in progress since 1951, and the idea of setting up Arab national oil enterprises had been officially mooted at least since 1954, the first Soviet comment on such moves seems to have appeared only in 1957, following the adoption of important resolutions on Arab oil policy

by the Arab League Economic Council in June of that year. In an article headed "A Lawful Aspiration" (SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.5 of 1957) A. Goykhbarg said that the nationalization of the Suez Canal Company had led to increased efforts by the "national bourgeoisie" of the Middle East countries to "play an independent role in the exploitation of natural resources". The Arab League Economic Council had approved a Saudi plan for an all-Arab pipeline and an Arab-owned tanker fleet. "The fact that such a proposal has been put forward is very significant. The Middle East peoples are unwilling to tolerate the monopoly rule of imperialist oil companies in their lands." Goykhbarg also cited other moves by individual Middle East countries - the Saudi plan for a national Saudi oil company, and the NIOC's plans for exploitation of the newly-discovered Qum oil deposits - as evidence that "it is becoming more and more difficult for the imperialists to exploit in monopoly fashion the natural resources of the Middle East".

In an article in NEW TIMES (No.39 of 1957) Y. Vasilyev represented these developments as part of "the battle to end the oil stranglehold", which, he said, was "an integral part of the battle against the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower doctrine". However, he observed that the Middle East Governments were contemplating "no fundamental revision" of their oil policies, and that although some "very bold projects" of a national or all-Arab character had been mooted, "their realization is of course impossible until the Arab countries get rid of Western military and political control".

More recent Soviet comment on moves for a common front of Middle East oil-producing countries has expressed warmer sympathy. B. Rachkov (VNESHNAYA TORGOVLYA No.5 of 1960) said that the Middle East countries' dependence on the concessionaries for oil refining and marketing was still a factor in Western calculations, "but one may doubt whether this situation will be maintained for long. The first all-Arab conference on oil questions, held in Cairo in the spring of 1959, showed that the producer countries are seriously determined to weaken the influence of this factor. The Arab countries, supported by the representatives of Venezuela attending the conference, declared their readiness to set up their own network of pipelines and their own tanker fleet." R. Andreasyan (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.7 of 1960) said that in recent years "the Arab countries have made certain progress as regards unity in the battle for oil"; the decisions of the Cairo oil conference "were of a rather vague nature", but the Jiddah oil conference of October 1959 had "expressed more completely and sharply the line of the free Arab countries on this question"; it had approved a joint stand on the return of unworked concession areas, increased Arab participation in the companies, and the maintenance of oil prices, and had agreed to cooperate with Persia and Venezuela for the joint defence of common interests in the world market. "Thereby the underdeveloped countries, which so far are unable to come

out on their own in the world market, are trying to deprive the cartel of the monopoly of establishing production levels and fixing oil prices in its selfish interests."

Thus Soviet support is now expressed for Government and inter-Governmental initiatives, and not, as before, only for demands by "the people's masses"; a gradual evolution of the relations between States and oil companies is envisaged, rather than a sudden rupture - although, as one writer puts it (R. Andreasyan, loc. cit.), a "decided change" is the final desideratum:

> "Today no one is able to deny that tendencies to revise the fettering agreements with cartel members and to set up national oil companies are making headway in the Middle East as a necessary condition for a decided change in the entire system of relations in the sphere of oil in favour of the Middle Eastern countries and the consolidation of their economic independence."

New concession agreements An example of Soviet solidarity with the demand for larger oil payments - even within the framework of "concessions to foreign capitalists" - is the Soviet attitude to agreements recently concluded between Middle East Governments and smaller independent companies, apparently offering more profitable terms. It is perhaps noteworthy that Soviet commentators have accepted at their face value the claims made for the new-type concession agreements, without any consideration of the actual profitability of the operations to be undertaken under these agreements. The idea that the new agreements (Andreasyan, loc. cit.) "break down the very basis of the 'fifty-fifty' principle", and the possibility that the Middle East countries may "break through to the 'holy of holies' of the cartel, the oil market", are obviously of too great propaganda value to be subjected to critical examination. However, some Soviet writers, while applauding the new agreements as a blow to the "oil monopolies", have found themselves obliged to withhold their full approval from developments which they regard as basically an episode in the rivalry of different oil companies, rather than as a success for national aspirations. The following account of Soviet comment on the subject shows this difference in attitudes.

Y. Vasilyev (NEW TIMES No.39 of 1957) "News of this agreement /the NIOC-AGIP agreement/ came as a shock to the American monopolies, For, first, it signified the appearance of a new rival in Iran. Second, the clause granting that country 75 per cent of net profits undermines the iron-clad cartel principle that no oil-producing country should receive more than 50 per cent. Third, the Americans cannot stomach the idea of someone else fixing the price of oil and underselling cartel members."

L. Teplov (SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.7 of 1958) "The auctioning of oil-bearing regions is a new phenomenon in the history of Persia. It bears witness to the serious intentions of the Persian Government to limit the activity of foreign capital in the country's oil industry... The 'Oil Law' and the Persian-Italian oil agreement have aroused the sharp displeasure of the Americans... The Persian Government is defending its positions and striving to use the oil wealth of the country in the national interests.../But/ the struggle for Persian oil between the oil monopolies of different capitalist countries... is gravely damaging to Persia's fundamental interests. There is no doubt that the Western colonizers will have to reckon with the categorical demand of the Persian public - 'oil, the national wealth of the country, must belong to Persia'."

I. Korobeynikov (MIR. EK. I MEZH. OTN. No.3 of 1960) "This /Persia's bigger share of profits under the AGIP agreement/ does not alter the essence of the matter - that the new agreements reflect the old policy of handing over the oil wealth of the country to be farmed out by foreign companies, and in no way assist the rapid development of a national oil industry."

B. Rachkov (VNESHNAYA TORGOVLYA No.5 of 1960) "The history of the financial relations between the host countries and the concessionary companies in the 1930s and 1940s is one of incessant struggle about the scale of profit per ton of oil produced. As the national liberation struggle grew, and the political positions of the under-developed and dependent countries became stronger, the concessionaries were obliged gradually to increase their payments for the exploitation of wealth that was not theirs. The scale of profits paid forms as it were a barometer of the political climate in the main oil-bearing regions... In the 1940s the intensification of the struggle of the under-developed countries for a share in the profits of the oil companies led to the appearance of the widely-publicized 'fifty-fifty' formula." Rachkov goes on to relate how the agreements concluded by Persia, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia with independent oil companies have broken through the "essentially extortionate" fifty-fifty rule; he suggests that the oil companies are now obliged gradually to "retreat", and concludes: "It only remains to add that this retreat is forced upon them, and, one must suppose, is not the last."

R. Andreasyan (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.7 of 1960 - summary, with quotations) Thanks to Soviet support, Egypt in 1956 - unlike Persia in 1953 - was successful in consolidating her victory over the imperialists, when she nationalized the Suez Canal Company. The changed international situation created prospects for the revision of oil agreements and the creation of national oil industries. The feudal and reactionary rulers of the Persian Gulf area tried to make use of the new situation in their own interests, so as to obtain a larger share of profits for personal enrichment and for development programmes - always on the principle

"development without social change". The "outsider" oil companies also hastened to take advantage of the weakened political position of the cartel members. "Not weighed down by fettering concession agreements, the outsiders lost no time in exploiting the spirit of the times and the fashionable slogan of 'anti-colonialism'. They announced that they were ready to accept concession terms unusually favourable for the countries concerned." The agreements concluded by Persia with Italian and other concerns do indeed accord Persia a 75 per cent profit share, but they deny Persia access to foreign markets. "In this respect Persia is in an unequal position, and this major advantage remains with the outsiders which are oil companies of imperialist States." The agreements concluded by Kuwait and Saudi Arabia with Japanese oil concerns, on the other hand, will give these countries a share in the profit on refining, transportation and marketing in the importing countries. "Although the cartel members like neither the Persian nor the Arabian type of agreement, they prefer the Persian. They are perturbed most by the possibility of the Middle Eastern countries breaking through to the 'holy of holies' of the cartel, the oil market ... On the other hand, the fears of the imperialist oil monopolies for the fate of their concession agreements proved premature. The Governments of the above-mentioned three countries have not commenced negotiations with the cartel members to remove unequal clauses from concession agreements with them or to modify them in the spirit of the agreements with outsiders."

Sahara oil The development of oil production in the Sahara has received much notice in Soviet periodicals. On the one hand, Soviet writers speak of the "oil wealth" of the Algerian Sahara - which, they affirm, belongs by right only to the Algerian people; on the other hand they bear in mind the possibility of competition between Sahara oil and Middle East oil, and seek to minimize the importance of the former. (Andreasyan notes that the Jiddah oil conference passed " a militant all-Arab anti-imperialist decision to boycott oil companies operating in Algeria".)

Until recently, a main theme in Soviet writing on this subject has been the allegedly dominant role of non-French capital in the Sahara project. Thus I. Genin (MIR. EK. I MEZH. OTN. No.12 of 1959) made an exhaustive examination of the participation of US, West German and other concerns, either under direct concessions or in partnership with French concerns. Andreasyan, however, asserts that "contrary to widespread opinion, French capital has so far preserved control over oil production in the Sahara". He presents the matter as a basically French initiative in which the "cartel members" will only participate on their own terms. "Although most of them have succeeded in getting their finger in the Sahara pie, they are very dissatisfied with the French oil laws which forbid the granting of concessions in the Sahara to non-French firms

and restrict their participation in mixed companies with French capital to not more than 50 per cent of the stock ... But the French Government is not lifting restrictions, rightly fearing that the cartel would very quickly push the weaker French companies into the background and inevitably gain control of Sahara oil."

Andreasyan discusses the possibility of Sahara oil emerging as a rival of Middle East oil. He says that when the Middle East countries began to put pressure on the oil companies "the monopolies repeatedly threatened to reroute new investments to other areas, primarily the Sahara". France, he observes, is now expecting not only to satisfy her own oil requirements with Sahara oil by 1963-4, but also to begin large exports to Common Market members. But the French plans, he says, are unrealistic in a number of respects: firstly, Sahara oil is entering the world market at a time when it is suffering from over-production; secondly, the oil reserves of the Sahara are only a fraction of Middle East oil reserves; thirdly, extraction costs in the Sahara are several times higher than in the Middle East.

Thus, while emphasizing the scale of Western investment in the development of Sahara oil production - allegedly at the expense of the Algerian people - Soviet writers are at pains to present the future of this project in the most discouraging terms.

Iraq and the UAR: Soviet assistance Soviet writers have consistently commended the measures taken by the Iraqi Republic in the field of oil policy. Approval has been expressed for the nationalization of the Khaniqin Oil Company, and for the demands that the Iraq Petroleum Company should increase output and that it and the Basrah Petroleum Company should give up unutilized concession areas. Andreasyan remarks that "Iraq is now engaged in the complete cycle of operations in the oil industry, from prospecting to the marketing of oil products", and that "one of the important factors which promoted the national oil programme was the appeal of the Iraqi Government for assistance to the Soviet Union". Iraq was the first large oil-exporting country to have done so; Soviet organizations were now prospecting for oil in Iraq and training Iraqis at the State oil refinery, and were to set up the first national enterprise for the production of nitrate fertilizers from natural gas, in Basrah.

Andreasyan also praises the UAR's measures for the development of a State oil industry, and writes with enthusiasm of Soviet-UAR cooperation in this field:

> "The Soviet-Egyptian cooperation agreement signed in 1957 provides for the building by Soviet organizations in the

> Egyptian region of five oil refineries and installations, with the object of eliminating the dependence of the UAR on oil product imports. This example graphically illustrates the unselfish nature of the assistance of the Soviet Union, which itself exports crude oil and oil products to Egypt. The Soviet Union also delivers to the Egyptian region equipment for oil prospecting, with the help of which the governmental General Petroleum Company has discovered a number of oil deposits. Such form of cooperation is effected in the Middle East for the first time. Soviet geological parties are helping to prospect for oil in the Syrian region as well. For all that, the USSR does not claim either concessions or a share of the profits of the new enterprises."

Such, says Andreasyan, are the steps taken by the independent Middle East countries to build up a national oil industry. In 1959 local capital extracted 1.1 per cent of the total Middle East output, and State-owned refineries refined 7 per cent of the total; "these figures are modest so far, but they express the spirit of the times which is slowly but steadily breaking its way through, symbolizing the era of the collapse of colonialism and the rise of a national economy in the independent eastern States."

Soviet oil and Middle East oil prices The question of Soviel oil prices and their effect on Western oil prices has received some notice in the Soviet press. On the one hand, Soviet commentators have claimed that the lower Soviet prices benefit the recipients and lead to a reduction in the prices of the "Western monopolies"; on the other hand, they deny that such competition is of a kind to inflict losses on the Middle East producing countries.

NEW TIMES (No.37 of 1960) said that under the Soviet-Indian oil agreement the price paid for Soviet oil was considerably lower than the price set by "the concerns that have cornered the Indian oil market", Caltex, Standard Oil and Burmah-Shell. "They have done everything to keep prices at a robber level. In 1958 they prevented the purchase of Rumanian oil products, and only recently rejected the Indian Government's proposal to refine Soviet crude oil at their plants. The Indian Government thereupon decided to buy oil products from the USSR, at normal and equitable prices." NET TIMES noted that, as a result, the Western companies had lowered their own prices by 7.5 per cent.

However, Soviet commentators have strenuously denied that lower Soviet oil prices have influenced Middle East oil prices. IZVESTIYA of 14th August 1960 said that allegations to this effect had been made by Muhammad Salman, Director of the Arab League Petroleum Office, while in

Venezuela. "Muhammad Salman, the chief expert on Middle East oil, as he is called by the press, has criticized the Soviet Union for wanting to sell crude oil at low prices. The Arab guest said: 'The Soviet decision to sell oil at reduced prices would pave the way for certain conditions which would inflict losses on all Arab oil-producing countries.' " But the point was, said IZVESTIYA, that the Western oil companies were using the sale of Soviet petroleum at a low price as a pretext for reducing Middle East oil prices, and thereby oil royalties, in order to achieve higher profits for themselves. It was the oil companies, not the Soviet Union, who were responsible for the losses to Middle East producers. "The reduced prices of Soviet petroleum do not affect the interests of the countries producing this valuable commodity, if they are compared with the high prices demanded by American companies."

In an article in EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA of 20th September 1960 A. Belyayev portrayed Muhammad Salman in a more favourable light, as defending Soviet oil policy:

> "If one takes the statements of the companies themselves at their face value, then the basic reason for cutting oil prices is that a new dangerous rival, the Soviet Union, has appeared in the world market. This fabrication, which was intended to set the Arab countries at loggerheads with our country, was doomed to an early failure from the very outset. Arab public opinion immediately saw through this rather stupid move. Dr. Muhammad Salman ... said that assertions that Western oil prices were being lowered because of competition from Soviet oil exports were groundless to say the least. According to Salman's statement, Soviet exports on the capitalist market constitute only two per cent of the amount of oil produced in the capitalist world."

Belyayev goes on to accuse the "oil monopolies" of a "plot" against the peoples of the under-developed countries; by reducing the posted prices, he says, they are "reducing the oil payments and thus increasing their profits".

Thus, in the Soviet view, the USSR is right in selling oil exports at "normal and equitable prices", while the Western oil companies are guilty of a "plot" when they lower their own prices. At the same time it is admitted (Andreasyan, loc. cit.) that the world market is suffering from over-production and that this has led to a fall in prices. Soviet writers show no concern to reconcile their conflicting assertions, evidently satisfied that to blame everything on "machinations" by the oil companies is sufficient.

The latest Soviet contribution to the argument is in an article by B. Rachkov in NEW TIMES No.39 of 1960. Rachkov says that Soviet oil is indeed sold at prices lower than those of "the cartel", but not "inordinately" so. At the same time he clames the big Western companies for (a) fixing their prices at an allegedly profiteering level, and (b) reducing prices and thus involving the Middle East countries in a loss of some 100 million dollars a year. The following is Rachkov's account of Soviet oil price policy:

> "Soviet oil is naturally sold in the world market not at the monopoly prices fixed by the oil cartel with the aim of netting as much as possible. Like many other dealers not connected with the oil cartel, Soyuzneftexport operates in the so-called free, that is non-monopolized, market, where the prices are considerably lower.
>
> "As the result of market competition, independent capitalist firms frequently sell their products 30 and even 40 per cent cheaper than the monopolies. It is at these discounted prices that many firms have been selling oil in the past two years, among them the American concerns Signal Oil, Superior Oil and Sun Oil. In the event of over-production members of the cartel themselves sell their produce in the free market at similarly discounted prices. The above-mentioned Soviet trade organization considers such discounts inordinately big and sells oil at normal market prices."

Such protestations are not only noteworthy for their complete disregard of logic. They are also evidence of the degree of Soviet involvement in Middle East oil politics, and of Soviet realization of this.

The future for Middle East oil It might appear from the above that closer attention to current oil politics has led Soviet commentators to overlook the larger questions of the future of Middle East oil. From Soviet broadcasts, however, it would appear that nationalization of oil resources is still regarded as the ideal for Middle East countries. A commentary by Aleksandrov, broadcast by Moscow radio in Persian on 22nd July this year, said:

> "The Cuban people, in their struggle for independence, have nationalized the establishments of the great Western oil companies. This move has not only impaired the interests of the oil monopolies in Cuba, but has also dealt a blow to the interests of the oil companies operating in Persia. This

measure, in fact, is of practical help to the Persian patriots who want to remove their oil resources from the hands of the Western monopolies."

Another theme treated in broadcasts but so far little discussed in Soviet writing is the need to make Middle East economies less dependent on oil revenues. On 10th August Moscow radio broadcast in Arabic a talk entitled "Can economy be developed only on the basis of oil revenues?" which maintained that, since oil prices were liable to fall, as recently, and since oil reserves were not inexhaustible, and since oil was controlled by "monopolies" who were only concerned for "their greedy objectives", the task of the oil-producing countries should be "to use present oil revenues to build up a comprehensive and developing economy":

"The idea of establishing a special national economy is strongly gaining ground. As enthusiasm and activity in this direction increases, countries get nearer to the goal of complete political and economic independence. In taking this path the Arabs will always find loyal and strong friends who will support them in developing their national industrial economy."

As Soviet economic relations with the Governments of Middle East countries become closer, the Soviet Union is increasingly committed to support for measures of State capitalism in these countries. The view is taken that in their economic measures Governments such as those of Iraq and the UAR express (or at least make common cause with) the aspirations of "progressive elements working for national liberation" (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.6 of 1959, p.3). But the idea that Middle East oil production as a whole might be capable of treatment as a subject for State capitalism has not yet been argued in any detail in Soviet writings.

THE MIDDLE EAST IN THE SOVIET PRESS

Below are reviewed reports on Middle East events appearing in Soviet newspapers during the period 13th September - 10th October.

Iraq Under the heading "An Iraqi court has closed down a democratic newspaper" PRAVDA of 4th October published the following account of the legal action taken against ITTIHAD ASH-SHA'B, the organ of the (no longer officially recognized) Iraqi Communist Party:

"The case brought against Abd al-Qadir Isma'il, the chief editor of ITTIHAD ASH-SHA'B, has been heard for three days in Iraq's Second Extraordinary Military Tribunal. He was accused of violation of the Press Law passed in 1954, that is, during the time of the despotic regime of Nuri as-Sa'id. Under the sentence passed on 1st October ITTIHAD ASH-SHA'B has been closed down for 10 months. Abd al-Qadir Isma'il has been sentenced to three months' imprisonment.

"ITTIHAD ASH-SHA'B was founded some years ago as the underground organ of the Iraqi Communist Party. Soon after the Iraqi revolution of 14th July it received permission to appear legally, and immediately became a mass newspaper and one of the most popular in the country. Its circulation reached 35,000, while no Iraqi bourgeois newspaper could exceed 15,000.

"The prosecution of ITTIHAD ASH-SHA'B is not a solitary instance of attack on the democratic press. A few days ago the chief editor of the Basrah workers' newspaper SAWT AT-TALI'AH was arrested. He is to appear in court in a few days' time."

The proceedings of the Sixth Congress of the International Union of Students in Baghdad were prominently reported in the Soviet press. The Soviet delegation to the Congress consisted of M. Zhuravleva, S. Aslanova, A. Oborotova, V. Sedova and V. Strizhko (KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5.10.60). In his message to the Congress Khrushchev emphasized the role of youth in solving the vital problems of world peace and the liquidation of colonialism (TRUD 9.10.60).

PRAVDA of 25th September reported the arrival in Moscow of Fadil Abbas al-Mahdawi, President of the Iraqi Supreme Military Court, on a visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Supreme Court.

UAR The dispute between the UAR and Jordan received little notice in the Soviet press during this period. The mutual accusations of the UAR and Jordanian leaders, press and radios were not mentioned. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA of 18th September reported the concentration of Jordanian forces on the Syrian border, and said that a Syrian frontier post had been destroyed by Jordanian artillery fire. On 27th September the same newspaper, quoting the UAR news agency MENA, said that British officers were directing the concentration of Jordanian forces on the frontier.

PRAVDA of 17th September quoted appreciative UAR press comment on Khrushchev's participation in the UN General Assembly session. It noted that Fikri Abaza, writing in the weekly AL-MUSAWWAR, had called Khrushchev "a bold and wise man" - bold for taking personal part in the Assembly session "in the heart of a state hostile to the Soviet Union",

and wise because he decided to carry the battle into the very stronghold of his opponents, "convinced of the fact that he is supported by the majority of African countries, the countries of positive neutrality and some Latin American countries".

PRAVDA (6. and 8.10.60) reported that the Minister of Economy of the Egyptian Region, Hasan Abbas Zaki, was in Moscow for discussions on the further development of trade relations between the UAR and the Soviet Union.

Lebanon Soviet newspapers quoted indignant comments by the Lebanese Opposition press on the visit of warships of the US Sixth Fleet to Beirut on 19th October. In PRAVDA of 10th October Yu. Yasnev said that there was a clear connection between this US display of strength and the present session of the UN General Assembly. "US reactionary circles are in a state of panic over the powerful support given by the neutral states of the East to the historic speech of the head of the Soviet State at the UN. The State Department is mobilizing all its forces to apply pressure on the delegations of the independent countries of Asia and Africa ... The blackmail and threats in New York and the show of force in the Lebanon are links in the same chain."

Turkey IZVESTIYA reported that on 29th September Prof. Taib Gokbilgin of Istanbul University gave a lecture in Moscow University's Institute of Eastern Languages on "Ataturk and the Turkish Revolution". The Turkish Ambassador Fahri Koruturk was present, and made a speech in which he expressed his hope for closer cultural and scientific relations between Turkey and the USSR.

TRUD of 11th September quoted an article in the Turkish newspaper DUNYA expressing the hope of closer trade relations between Turkey and the USSR.

Israel TRUD of 16th September published a letter signed by 106 Indian emigrants to Israel which appeared in the Indian newspaper BLITZ, complaining that conditions in Israel were such that they were "dying of hunger", and appealing for assistance to bring them back to India. Commenting on the letter, N. Gusarov said that it was not surprising that the Indian emigrants were subjected to oppression and discrimination. "Israel is a bourgeois state, a puppet of the USA. All forms of exploitation are natural to it, including oppression and racial discrimination." The main concern of the Israel Government was "to build up its armed forces and to mature plans for the seizure of others' lands".

SOVIET WRITING ON GUINEA

Soviet writing on Guinea before independence Soviet writers paid very little attention to Guinea before it voted for independence outside the French Community in September 1958. In the volumes of the GREAT SOVIET ENCYCLOPAEDIA published in 1952 French Guinea is given half a page while the Gold Coast gets three times as much. The description of the country is followed by a brief note that penetration of American capital has increased since the Second World War, and that the liberation struggle is headed by the Democratic Party. Soviet writing on the liberation movement in French West Africa as a whole makes no special mention of Guinea. The reforms carried out by the Guinean Democratic Party at the end of 1957, including the abolition of the institution of cantonal chiefs which "everyone who followed events in Guinea agrees ... created the premises for the declaration of Guinea's independence" (J. Suret-Canale in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.11 of 1959), were not remarked on at the time, and the note in NEW TIMES No.33 of August 1958 recording that Sekou Toure and other representatives of political parties in French Africa had condemned the new French draft constitution gave no reason to suppose that Guinea was any more likely to vote for independence than the other territories.

It was, however, noted by G.F. Skorov (FRENCH IMPERIALISM IN WEST AFRICA, Moscow 1956) that in Guinea, as in Senegal and the Cameroons, "the influence of the proletariat is stronger than in the other colonies"; both the trade union movement and the local RDA group had taken a more radical line than elsewhere in French West Africa where Right-wing leaders were in control.

Soviet writing on Guinea since independence The USSR was one of the first countries to recognize the new Republic, and in a message to Sekou Toure hailed its inauguration as "an important stage in Africa's liberation from colonial oppression". Articles celebrating Guinea's independence appeared in INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK and MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA. Since then short articles by Soviet and Guinean contributors have appeared frequently in NEW TIMES, SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK and INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, reporting on the current Guinean scene, but as yet Guinea has not been the subject of any more scholarly study either in the learned journals or in book form.

Soviet relations with Guinea Soviet writing makes much of the difficulties France created immediately after independence when she stopped all credits and withdrew all her personnel "who took with them everything

they could ... even plumbing fictures". "Apparently it was believed in Paris", N. Gavrilov remarks in NEW TIMES No.4 of 1959, "that these hostile acts, tantamount to an economic blockade, would bring Guinea to her knees." "At this critical time", says a leader in NEW TIMES No.36 of 1959, "the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries came to Guinea's aid, recognizing her sovereignty and immediately extending to her substantial assistance." Even had the French reaction been different, it continues, "they could not have prevented friendship and economic cooperation between Guinea and the Soviet Union and the other socialist States. Nations breaking out of the octopus grip of colonialism seek support first and foremost in the socialist sector of the world. That is only logical."

The Soviet Union signed a trade agreement in Conakry on 13th February 1959 under which Guinea would import machinery, cars, oil products, cement, cotton goods, sugar, etc. and send to the USSR bananas, coffee and pineapples. On 24th August 1959 a Soviet-Guinean communique was signed in Moscow providing for economic and technical collaboration, and Guinea was given a long-term credit of 140 million roubles for 12 years at 2.5 per cent. A protocol on technical assistance was signed on 1st March 1960 (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.7 of 1960, p.19).

Several high-level delegations have already visited the USSR, including government and parliamentary delegations in August 1959, a cultural delegation in April 1960 and Sekou Toure himself in November 1959 and September 1960. In the other direction, Rashidov, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Uzbek Communist Party, headed a delegation to the Fifth Extraordinary Conference of the Democratic Party in September 1959, and in January 1960 Khrushchev accepted an invitation to visit Guinea.

Unique political conditions In a series of articles called "The Guinean Experiment" in NEW TIMES Nos.24, 25 and 29 of 1960 Yu. Bochkarev describes how "in several important respects the political development of the Republic of Guinea differs from that of other former colonies. These differences are: the mass character of the Democratic Party, to which a substantial section of the adult population belongs; the absence of a feudal class and the weakness of the local bourgeoisie; no private ownership of land." Since, under colonial rule, foreign trade was monopolized by the French and wholesale and even retail trade were dominated by foreigners, there was no possibility of a distinct middle class emerging. According to J. Suret-Canale, the French director of the Guinea State Institute of Scientific Research and Documentation, writing in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.11 of 1959, the traditional tribal chiefs of the patriarchal slave-owning society that existed in Guinea before colonialism were abolished by the French in the years 1890-1910.

The so-called "cantonal chiefs" were appointees of the French who exploited and robbed the peasants to satisfy their masters' demands and eke out their miserable salaries. "With the abolition of thos chieftains", says Bochkarev, "there also disappeared that small section of the local population that lived by the direct exploitation of the peasantry." He adds that "the primary, vital feature of the Republic is the virtual absence of the basic exploiting classes."

The Democratic Party in Guinea Soviet writers stress the wholehearted popular support for the Democratic Party in Guinea. "In Guinea there is only one party which enjoys the undivided support of the people and undivided influence", says Bochkarev. When the Democratic Party won the elections to the territorial assembly in March 1957 "it launched a programme of democratic reform which included such measures as abolition of the institute of tribal chiefs and the transfer of local authority to elected administrative councils, emancipation of women, lower taxes for peasants, higher wages for workers and an end to racial discrimination. This gave the party a strong popular following." (Gavrilov in NEW TIMES No.4 of 1959). Bochkarev remarks that Western critics of the one-party system do not stop to think that "Guinea's social and economic structure affords no soil for a multi-party system. For, when there are, in substence, no opposing classes in a country, one political party fully suffices to express the interests of the broad masses."

Descriptions of Democratic Party organization and activity must have a familiar ring to Soviet ears. Bochkarev talks of the primary organizations in each village and how draft legislation is passed down to them for discussion by the Political Bureau before enactment. The Democratic Party has its women's, youth and children's organizations. Several writers describe how immediately after independence the people started voluntarily to build roads, schools and clinics and government officials expressed themselves willing to accept reduced salaries in view of the country's financial difficulties. There is even "a patriotic movement ... to pay the annual state tax ahead of time" (Bochkarev) and "they call each other 'comrade'" (IZVESTIYA of 5.5.60).

The trade unions The basic role of the trade union movement in the liberation struggle is mentioned by several writers. It is pointed out that Sekou Toure started as a trade union leader and continues to be president of the General Workers' Union of Black Africa, and trade union leaders fill most of the important posts in the Democratic Party. Mohamed Lamine N'diaye, a Guinean trade union leader, writing in NEW TIMES No.16 of 1959, says that "the unions are to all intents and purposes in power".

"The Guinean experiment" Bochkarev describes the Democratic Party's programme as "a sober purposeful one designed to further the interests of the masses". As Sekou Toure has stated, its gist is "decolonialization", that is, replacing the system and conceptions of colonialism by Guinean formulae. Bochkarev quotes Sekou Toure's statement that "Guinea's experiment is a typically African experiment; it has not been copied from either the European or Asian countries." In fact Soviet writers do not make any claims that Soviet experience is being applied in Guinea, but G. Dragunov (reviewing "Guinea - A Pioneer State" by Fernand Gigon, in INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.11 of 1959) remarks that Gigon notes that the experience of People's China in the political and social fields is often being used in Guinea. Bochkarev says that a democratic system of State and local government has already been established. The leadership of the Democratic Party has rejected the capitalist path of development and does not want to see the rise of a bourgeoisie. To avoid this they have moved towards a cooperative system with two big national organizations: The National Union of African Supply Cooperatives, uniting small dealers in imported goods, and the Mutual Aid Society for Rural Development, which markets the peasants' crops and supplies them with seed, fertilizers and implements. However, Bochkarev remarks that "it will be impossible to avoid a certain amount of [social] differentiation. Although the bourgeoisie is weak ... it is growing. On the other hand ... industrialization will lead to the growth of the working class." Land has been nationalized but individual peasant families still work their plots virtually as private owners and industry is almost wholly privately owned, with foreign monopoly capital predominating."

Economic independence Soviet writers stress that Guinea is a country rich in natural resources but that colonial rule left it in a state of economic backwardness that is "truly incredible". The rich bauxite and iron-ore deposits are mined by foreign capitalists, mainly French, there is virtually no other industry of any kind and basic supplies have to be imported although the country was self-sufficient in this respect prior to colonialism. The problem after attaining political independence was to gain economic independence too and free the Guinean people from "the clutches of the colonialist trading companies". S. Volk in SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.12 of 1958 said that immediately after independence cooperative marketing organizations were being set up in the villages to protect the peasants from the agents of European firms buying up their produce at very low prices. In 1959 a Foreign Trade Office was established to control all foreign trade, which "ensures the import of goods really necessary for the population and resists the attempts of foreign speculators to foist all sorts of rubbish on the Guineans" (SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.5 of 1960). On 1.3.60 Guinea announced that she was establishing her own currency and withdrawing from the franc area. "This was a serious blow for the colonialists" says

B. Pavel'tsev, writing in PRAVDA of 2.10.60, since "foreign companies were deprived of the possibility of pumping capital out of the country." According to V. Shmelev, (MIR. EK. I MEZH. OTN. No.6 of 1960) these measures noticeably improved the country's foreign exchange position and the free voluntary labour of the population, equivalent to a capital investment of 5 milliard African francs in the first 10 months of 1959, helped in the steady decrease in economic dependence on the former mother-country.

The Three-Year Plan Bochkarev and others point out that with an overwhelmingly agricultural population it is natural that the main emphasis in the three-year plan for 1960-62 is on agriculture, the aim being to make the country self-sufficient in foodstuffs and increase production of export crops, thus obtaining the foreign currency to buy industrial equipment. J. Suret-Canale ("Planning Problems in the Guinea Republic", SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.2 of 1960) writes that the Guinea economy "will be based as before on the sale of raw materials (mainly agricultural) and purchases of manufactured goods". The introduction of more advanced farming methods in agriculture, basically a financial problem, can be achieved only by two methods: increasing the income of the peasants by limiting the arbitrariness of the trading companies, and encouraging collective working of the land, on which a start has already been made. State farms are also being set up. As regards industry, Suret-Canale says that a sober assessment has shown that in the near future Guinea can only build small factories for processing agricultural produce and manufacturing simple consumer goods. "Guinea does not scorn major projects of industrialization (the building of a dam on the river Konkoure and development of the aluminium industry), but at this stage they cannot be problems of paramount importance."

Industrialization and the aluminium industry A. Solonitskiy (MIR. EK. I MEZH. OTN. No.1 of 1959) noted that even before independence the leaders of the liberation movement declared: "The use of the electric power potential of the territory for the production of aluminium must become the basis of the industrialization of the country". The combination of very rich bauxite deposits and cheap power in Guinea had already attracted the "greedy interest" of international capital, and in July 1958 the Fria consortium drew up plans to build a big aluminium combine in Fria and hydro-electric stations on the river Konkoure to supply the large quantities of electricity necessary. S. Gorskiy ("The Intrigues of Bonn against Guinea", SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK No.8 of 1960) says that these plans were rudely interrupted by Guinea's declaration of independence. The shareholders immediately halted the construction of the electric power station, but the construction of the combine itself was

too far advanced to be halted, and in any case "the Government of the young Guinea Republic would not have allowed it". In fact the Guineans demanded better conditions for the native workers. The shareholders agreed for fear of losing the millions already invested, but planned revenge. The recent plot against Guinea was supplied with American, German and British weapons; "the knife in the back of the young Republic was forged in the shareholder countries of the Fria aluminium combine." Suret-Canale (op. cit.) claims that colonialist offers of aid in building the dam demanded a change in Guinea's foreign policy orientation, and had therefore been rejected. (The Soviet Union is now to participate in the project; it was announced in the communique at the end of Sekou Toure's recent visit to the USSR that "meeting the request of the Government of the Republic of Guinea, the Soviet Government has expressed its final agreement and readiness to participate in realizing the construction of the complex of installations planned on the river Konkoure".)

Social relations Bochkarev and others write approvingly of the Democratic Party's policy in the social sphere. They are waging a resolute struggle against "survivals of the past" and "religious myths". Laws fixing a minimum marriage age for a girl, requiring her consent to the marriage and limiting the bride-price, which now goes to the girl herself instead of her parents, are a severe blow to Islam which the majority of the population profess. Polygamy is discouraged but has not yet been forbidden. The Democratic Party insists that both women and youth are represented on the committees of the party's primary organizations. Witch doctors' carved idols have been burnt, but Bochkarev comments that this is not a very effective method. When Guinea voted for independence there were very few educated Guineans and few schools. Already there has been a big increase in the number of school-children, and the curriculum has been reorganized with the emphasis on the natural sciences and African history and culture.

In a review of "Guinea - A Pioneer State" by Fernand Gigon in INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.11 of 1959 it is noted that relations between whites and Africans have improved considerably since independence. There is no enmity towards the French as a nation and French has remained the official language. Guinea welcomed French experts who came to her aid.

Foreign policy A large measure of agreement on foreign policy was revealed in the communique at the end of Sekou Toure's visit to the USSR in November 1959. Sekou Toure declared his Government's support for the USSR's efforts to reduce international tension and the Soviet proposals for general disarmament put forward at the 14th General

Assembly of the UN. The Soviet Government declared its sympathy for Guinea's policy of "positive neutrality", and both countries agreed that the liquidation of the colonial system was one of the most important tasks of our time. Sekou Toure himself received high praise in a leader in NEW TIMES No.49 of 1959 after the visit, which spoke of "the acumen and eloquence of this outstanding African leader" and his "noble ideals" and "indomitable spirit". Sekou Toure's statement at a public meeting in the Kremlin is quoted: "We know there is the imperialist and there is the anti-imperialist. We are fighting imperialism and are therefore allies of the world that has chosen freedom and peace for all nations."

The joint declaration by Sekou Toure and Kwame Nkrumah on 23.11.58 about forming the nucleus of a United States of West Africa from Guinea and Ghana, and Ghana's offer to Guinea of a credit of £10 m and technical and administrative assistance, were welcomed as "another proof of the growing solidarity of the African peoples, and their unswerving desire for unity in the struggle to liquidate the political and economic yoke of the imperialists on the whole continent".

It is evident that the main factor in determining Soviet sympathy for Guinea is the "anti-imperialist" orientation of Guinea's foreign policy. But Guinea's internal policy, judged on its own merits, seems to elicit genuine and in some cases enthusiastic Soviet approval. It is accepted, on Sekou Toure's own terms, as "a typically African experiment" which "has not been copied from either the European or Asian countries". Certain weaknesses are noted, such as the fact that the peasants still work the land virtually as private owners, that the bourgeoisie is growing, and that foreign capital predominates in industry. The ideological affinities or differences between Soviet Communism and the Guinean "experiment" have not yet been examined in any detail in Soviet writing. In general, Guinea's successes are hailed as a blow to the colonialists and an inspiration to the still dependent countries of Africa. But no attempt is made to present the Guinean pattern as an exact blueprint for other African countries to follow; it is emphasized that in many respects conditions in Guinea were and are of a special kind.

ZIMBABWE: A COMMENT

The following comments on L.A. Fadeyev's thesis about the origins of Zimbabwe and other stone ruins in Southern Rhodesia (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.8 of 1960) have been supplied by a correspondent.

Fadeyev: "/Bourgeois/ researchers, explaining the origin and development of different sides of the /Zimbabwe/ culture, are inclined to connect them not with the internal development of society but with migrations and an intermingling of cultural influences, without which they are unable to imagine a single major advance in culture."

"In the territory between the Zambezi and the Limpopo ... the Wilton epoch was characterized by lengthy interaction between the ancestors of the Bushmen and the Bantu who constantly penetrated into the region between the two rivers."

Comment: Having denied the influence of migrations, Fadeyev seems to contradict himself by speaking of "lengthy interaction". It is of course impossible to deny "intermingling of cultural influences" in Africa.

Fadeyev claims that the "ancestors of the Bushmen" played a basic role in the development of the Zimbabwe culture; but he gives no indication what this term means, although apparently it is fundamental to his thesis. In any case, these "ancestors" must have lived long before the building of Zimbabwe.

Fadeyev: "The culture of iron in the region between the two rivers has its roots in the local neolithic period."

Comment: The use of iron was not introduced into Central Africa until the first millennium A.D. Metallurgy is certainly an important element in African culture, and was not developed independently in Rhodesia.

The following general comment on the subject is added:

> "The truth seems to be that Zimbabwe, that is the group of structures known as Great Zimbabwe with the conical tower and other features, does go back to the first millennium A.D., and that it was the work of Africans. But there may have been other cultural influences at work as well; and certainly iron-working is not of African origin here or elsewhere in the continent.

"Most of the other ruins of Great Zimbabwe type in Southern Rhodesia are much later, from the 15th century onwards, and the majority belong in fact to the 18th and 19th centuries."

AFRICA IN THE SOVIET PRESS

Below are reviewed reports on African affairs appearing in the Soviet press during the period 11th July - 11th October 1960. (Note: Reports on the Congo of the period 26th July - 21st September were reviewed in the last issue of the Newsletter.)

Congo

On 25th September IZVESTIYA published a final dispatch on the Congo events, datelined Accra, from its correspondent N. Khokhlov. Khokhlov said that when he and the Tass correspondent went to the Leopoldville telegraph office on 15th September they were stopped by armed UN guards; by an "outrageous decision" the UN command had prevented correspondents of the socialist countries from communicating with their newspapers. Khokhlov went on to allege that the UN forces were "suppressing every national element and supporting the forces of collective colonialism"; Kasavubu was guarded by UN soldiers - while Lumumba was protected by "the Congolese people and soldiers who remain loyal to him to the end"; Mobutu had given the game away when, in reply to a question about his relations with the UN, he said "the UN supports us". Why had not the UN taken under its protection the premises of the lawful Government and Parliament, which had recently been emptied and prevented from functioning? Locked out of the Senate building, two senators had turned to the correspondents and told them to report these shocking events to their newspapers; "help us to regain our democratic rights." Patriotic Congolese newspapers such as CONGO had disappeared, to be replaced by COURRIER D'AFRIQUE, "financed by Catholic circles and abusive to all patriots". Pamphlets slandering the Soviet Union had begun to be distributed. "The reactionaries in Leopoldville and Brussels who cut telephone and telegraphic communications with Moscow had only one aim - to make it impossible for Soviet citizens to stay in the Congo Republic." Bourgeois correspondents had raised an uproar about the Soviet aircraft which had arrived in Stanleyville at the request of the Congolese Government; they had photographed all the aircraft and all the Soviet pilots, and had even "looked around inside the aircraft in the hope of finding mythical arms". Avid for sensation, they had kept a 24-hour watch round the Soviet Embassy before the departure of the Embassy staff;

but, contrary to their hopes, the crowds of Congolese had engaged in a demonstration of their heartfelt affection for the Soviet Union. "None of us, on temporarily leaving the country, heard a single unfriendly word, although we knew that provocateurs had been sent into the crowd. We replied joyfully to the words 'Come back again!' and 'See you again soon!' "

Subsequently Soviet press reports on the Congo, quoting Western agency messages about Lumumba's activities, have continued to depict him as enjoying the support of the Congolese people and Mobutu as supported only by the UN command and the Western powers.

Soviet commentators have had less to say about the Congo events during this period. K. Smirnov (IZVESTIYA 4.10.60) quoted a telephone interview given to the NEW YORK MIRROR by the US Ambassador to the Congo, Mr. Timberlake, for alleged revelations of US activity behind the scenes. Timberlake, said Smirnov, had recalled that at the first outbreak of unrest in the Congo he had informed the US Government that a US "air lift" was necessary, and that UN assistance must be obtained; he had thereby revealed whose hand was behind the "operation of assistance to the Belgian colonizers ... which with Hammarskjoeld's ready approval was covered up with the UN flag". Timberlake had also made fantastic allegations about Russian "plans to seize power" in the Congo, claiming that between 400 and 450 Russians and Czechs had arrived in the Congo on the Soviet aircraft, and that the Soviet doctors had arrived laden with propaganda material. Such absurb fabrications, said Smirnov, showed that the "McCarthy mentality" was still prevalent in certain US circles.

Mali

PRAVDA of 21st August, in a Tass dispatch from Paris, gave the first news of Senegal's secession from the Mali Federation. Detailed accounts of the events were given in newspapers on 22nd August, in a Tass dispatch from Conakry in Guinea (BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY) and in a dispatch from PRAVDA's correspondent in Conakry, V. Mayevskiy. Mayevskiy said that the President of the Federal Assembly Leopold Senghor and the Premier of Senegal Mamadou Dia, "who are known for their links with French circles", had recently returned from a visit to Paris. During the night of 20th August "reactionary elements" grouped around these two leaders had seized the Dakar radio station and telegraph offices and all administrative offices and had set up "a local Senegalese 'Parliament' which declared the secession of Senegal from the Mali Federation". From Bamako in Sudan the Mali Government had sent a telegram to the UN asking for the suppression of the conspiracy. When Modibo Keita, the Premier of the Federal Government, tried to mobilize the armed forces to put

down the conspirators, French officers commanding the army opposed this, and Keita and other Sudanese Ministers were arrested. The news of this new plot by the colonialists had aroused indignation in Guinea, where it was regarded as an attempt to repeat the secessionist manoeuvre of the puppet Tshombe in Katanga. TRUD of 23rd August published part of the Mali message to the UN, which had been forwarded to Sekou Toure for his information.

Subsequent reports on the election of Leopold Senghor as President of Senegal were published without comment. On 16th September PRAVDA reported the arrival in Moscow of a delegation from the Mali Federation consisting of the Minister of Labour and Social Affairs Usman Ba and the President of the Trade Union Federation of Sudan Lazar Kulibali; they had had friendly talks with the Chairman of the Cultural Relations Committee G.A. Zhukov, the Deputy Foreign Minister Ya. A.Malik and the Chairman of the Economic Relations Committee I.V. Arkhipov.

On 10th October PRAVDA published the messages of good wishes sent by Khrushchev to the Premiers of the newly established Republics of Mali (former Sudan) and Senegal.

Guinea

Sekou Toure's visit to Moscow on 6th-8th September was prominently and extensively reported in Soviet newspapers. PRAVDA published in full the speeches exchanged between Khrushchev and Sekou Toure on the latter's arrival and departure and at a luncheon in the Kremlin on 7th September. In his speech on the latter occasion Khrushchev expressed the Soviet people's admiration and support for Guinea's independent policy; denounced "imperialist fabrications" about "Soviet expansion" in Africa; and condemned "the imperialist plot against the Congo - a plot against all the African peoples". Much of Sekou Toure's speech was devoted to arguing that of the newly independent African states 15 were in fact fettered by agreements with the colonialist powers which made their independence illusory. Emphasizing that the socialist countries' aid to Africa was now of infinite value", he said: "If the neo-colonialists are allowed to operate freely, they will again establish themselves in Africa, although behind new masks. For this reason the time factor is the effective element in aid to the African peoples."

According to a joint Soviet-Guinean communique published on 8th September, the discussions between the Soviet and Guinean sides had revealed complete agreement on world problems - the defence of peace, disarmament and the prohibition of nuclear tests, and "the immediate and unconditional liquidation of the shameful colonial system". The Soviet policy of support for the African peoples was "not of an ad hoc

(kon'yunturnyy) character", but a practical expression of the Leninist principle of support for peoples fighting for their national freedom and independent development, in conformity with the Bandung ideals. There was full accord between the two sides about the situation resulting from "imperialist aggression" in the Congo Republic. Both sides expressed satisfaction at the development of Soviet-Guinean relations. Questions concerning the further development of economic and technical cooperation and trade were discussed and successfully settled. "The Soviet Government ... is already collaborating in the implementation of the three-year plan of development of the national economy of the Guinean Republic. In response to the request of the Guinean Government, the Soviet Government has expressed its definitive agreement and readiness to take part in the construction of a complex of projects on the river Konkoure."

The second anniversary of Guinea's independence on 2nd October was the occasion for long articles in Soviet newspapers reviewing Guinea's successes during the past two years.

Ghana

Talks on cultural cooperation between the Soviet Union and Ghana were held in Accra on 23rd-25th August between G.A. Zhukov, Chairman of the Soviet Committee for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, and the Ghanaian Minister of Education (PRAVDA 27.8.60). A permanent agreement on cultural cooperation was signed, and also a protocol on cultural exchange during 1960-61. PRAVDA published extracts from a leading article in the GHANA TIMES on the theme of Soviet-Ghanaian solidarity and Soviet assistance for the African peoples in the struggle against colonialism.

On 17th September PRAVDA published a dispatch from its special correspondent in Accra, O. Orestov, on the opening of the permanent Soviet industrial exhibition in Accra.

KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA (18.8.60) reported the warm welcome given to a delegation of Ghanaian cooperative members, led by the Ghana Minister of Labour and Cooperatives, which arrived in Stalinabad on 17th August.

IZVESTIYA of 30th August reported that a Soviet-Ghanaian agreement on economic and technical cooperation and also a trade agreement had recently been signed in Moscow.

"The agreement on economic and technical cooperation provides that both sides will collaborate in carrying out a geological survey for minerals in Ghana, in constructing industrial undertakings for the production of building materials, hydroelectric power stations, enterprises for processing agricultural products, undertakings of the fish industry, the organization of model state agricultural farms and in the construction of undertakings in other sectors of Ghana's economy and also in the training of Ghanaian national technical personnel.

"The list of undertakings and their capacity, and also the volume and dates of delivery of equipment from the USSR and provision by Soviet organizations of other forms of technical collaboration in the construction of the said enterprises will be fixed by both sides after Soviet specialists jointly with specialists of the Republic of Ghana have studied the necessary material and worked out technical and economic schemes for the construction of the aforementioned undertakings.

"To pay for the expenses of the Soviet organizations in providing the technical assistance envisaged by the said agreement, the Government of the USSR has granted the Government of the Republic of Ghana a long-term credit of 160,000,000 roubles on the same advantageous terms which have been granted by the Government of the USSR to other economically underdeveloped countries.

"The trade agreement provides for a reciprocal most favoured nation clause in all questions of trade and navigation, and also establishes a clearing system for accounts on trade operations between both countries.

"An appendix to the agreement gives list of goods for reciprocal deliveries, which provide for the export from the Soviet Union to Ghana of various machines and equipment, rolled ferrous and non-ferrous metals, oil products, building materials, chemical goods, and also certain consumer goods including textiles and foodstuffs. Cocoa beans, coffee, copra, oil seeds, raw hides, rubber, citrus and tropical fruits and other traditional Ghanaian exports are included in the lists of goods for export from Ghana to the USSR."

Nigeria

In his message of congratulations to the Premier of the Federation of Nigeria, on Nigeria's accession to independence, Khrushchev expressed the Soviet people's "sincere pleasure that the most populous country in Africa has become an independent state". This was "new evidence of the historical inevitability of the complete collapse of the shameful system of colonialism"; the day was not far off when the whole of Africa would be free. The Soviet Government, in accordance with its policy of friendship and cooperation with all countries whatever their social and political system, declared its recognition of Nigeria's independence and its desire to establish diplomatic relations with it, and hoped that friendly relations based on mutual understanding and close cooperation would be established between both countries and peoples (PRAVDA 1.10.60). IZVESTIYA, reporting the reception of the Soviet Government delegation by the Nigerian Premier, said that when the delegation expressed thanks for being invited, Alhaji Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa replied: "The people and Government of the Federation of Nigeria could not think of holding their festivities without their Soviet friends."

Nigerian independence was the occasion of special articles in Soviet newspapers. PRAVDA's special correspondent Orestov (1.10.60) said that the participation of the NCNC in Nigeria's coalition Government had "exerted a positive influence" on the Government's foreign policy; on the eve of independence the Premier had told journalists that his Government did not want the country to join any bloc, and was ready to accept aid from any country which was ready to give it. The reactionary British press, said Orestov, was claiming that Britain had made Nigeria a "present" of independence, and was not concealing the hope that everything would "stay as before". But the people's masses and the younger generation of Nigerians thought otherwise; "wait till our country becomes independent", they said, "and then we shall see that our independence is real and complete, and foreign influence will have no place in Nigeria."

TRUD's special correspondent V. Sisnev described an interview with Kodilinil Onidelo, the President of the Nigerian Constitutional Movement - "one of the big political parties, whose influence is particularly strong in central Nigeria". Onidelo told the correspondent that, if the British had had the slightest hope of preserving their position in Nigeria, "you would not now be in Lagos". The "former managers of the fate of Nigeria" would of course try to cling on to their positions, "but the future is in the hands of the Nigerians". The latter now had a heavy task to turn their country into a modern state; the condition of the outskirts of Lagos, compared with the centre, was evidence of this. Commenting on Onidelo's remarks, Sisnev contrasted the "palatial many-storeyed residences" of central Lagos with the "miserable shacks"

further out, and observed: "In these palatial residences they sing the praises of the colonizers for their 'generosity', but in the shacks they told me that if the Soviet Union had not been in existence they would have had to wait many many years for this 'generosity'."

IZVESTIYA of 3rd October reported that the Nigerian Trade Union Congress had issued a statement demanding that the Federation of Nigeria should pursue a policy of non-adherence to blocs and should not allow the creation of any foreign military bases on its territory.

Other Newly Independent African States

The new African States which proclaimed their independence during August - Dahomey (1st August), Niger (3rd), Upper Volta (5th), Ivory Coast (7th), Chad (11th), Central African Republic (13th), French Congo (15th) and Gabon (17th) - received messages of congratulation from Khrushchev, which were published in the Soviet press. The import of all these messages was substantially the same: that the Soviet Union, as a sincere supporter of the self-determination of nations, declared its recognition of the state in question and its desire to establish diplomatic relations with it, expressing the hope that friendly relations would be developed in the interests of international cooperation and peace. Articles describing each country appeared in the Soviet press; these did not, as earlier in the case of Mali (MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.7, p.17) complain that the independence of the new states was circumscribed by their agreements with France.

The Malagasy independence celebrations of 30th - 31st July were prominently reported by PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA, being covered by their special correspondents in Tananarive. IZVESTIYA published an account of Madagascar in a series of three long articles by its correspondent Kudryavstev. A Soviet Government delegate attended the independence celebrations, and messages of congratulation were sent to President Tsiranana by Brezhnev and Khrushchev.

Other Countries

Mauritania TRUD of 13th September published a Tass report from Rabat on demonstrations against "the present Government of Ould Daddah" in Mauritania. This said that tens of thousands of inhabitants of the capital of Mauritania had come out in demonstrations demanding the union of Mauritania with Morocco and opposing "the further subjection of Mauritania to French colonialism under the pretext of granting it apparent independence". French forces had opened fire on the demonstrators, killing 20 and injuring many others.

Liberia IZVESTIYA of 26th July published an article on Liberia, in connection with the forthcoming exchange of visits between President Tubman and Khrushchev. This gave an account of Liberia's economic progress under Tubman's Presidency, but sharply criticized the operations of US companies in Liberia. It noted that Liberia's foreign policy was one of support for the independence of African countries and close collaboration with them, and that President Tubman, asked if recent international developments would have any effect on his proposed exchange of visits with Khrushchev, had denied this.

Kenya IZVESTIYA of 26th July gave an account of Tom Mboya's press conference in New York, at which he stated his demand that independence for Kenya should be declared immediately after the country's general elections. PRAVDA of 20th August reported that Mikoyan had had a friendly conversation with Oginda Odinga, who was visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for Afro-Asian Solidarity.

Rhodesia and Nyasaland TRUD and other newspapers on 26th July reported the disturbance in Bulawayo, stating that the reason for them was "the suppression by the British authorities of any political activity among the basic population of the country"; a statement by the Central Africa Party to this effect was quoted.

Reports on the London conference on the Nyasaland Constitution said that "the advance of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Nyasaland" had "compelled" the British Government to enter into discussions. But as a result of the conference "the British Government fastened on the African representatives of the colony conditions which in essence strengthen the positions of the colonialists in Nyasaland"; as before all authority was kept in the Governor's hands, and out of 3m. inhabitants only 100,000 had the right to vote (TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA 7.8.60).

South Africa Extracts from a pamphlet issued by the South African Communist Party and published in the DAILY WORKER of 23rd August were quoted in a Tass dispatch from London published in PRAVDA of 24th August. The South African Communist Party, said PRAVDA, had described the present South African Government as "fascist"; over 2,000 men and women had been thrown into prison without trial after armed raids on the African population; "the proper name for these activities is Hitlerism."

Portuguese Africa PRAVDA of 3rd August published an article by Yaduim Tavares, a member of the political bureau of the Union of the Population of Angola, "whose central committee is now in Leopoldville". Tavares put forward the demands of his organization for the establishment of a "democratic republic of Angola" and appealed to all friends of the colonial peoples for aid in "the rapid liberation of the Portuguese colonies from the yoke of the imperialists". On the occasion of the "day of solidarity with the peoples of the Portuguese colonies", 3rd August, PRAVDA published (4.8.60) an article by Potekhin, who said that recent mass demonstrations in many towns in Angola were evidence of the popular appeal of the underground UPA organization, formed in 1954. He also mentioned the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola, formed soon after the first Conference of African Peoples in Accra, and the African Revolutionary Front for the National Independence of the Portuguese Colonies.

Algeria Ferhat Abbas, head of the "Algerian provisional Government", arrived in Moscow on 27th September and left for Pekin on the night of 28th September; he arrived back in Moscow on 6th October, leaving on 10th October. In Khrushchev's absence, Ferhat Abbas and his colleagues had talks with the Vice-Chairman of the Soviet Council of Ministers A.N. Kosygin. No details of the talks were announced. In a farewell speech (PRAVDA 11.10.60) Kosygin remarked that Khrushchev had "stated to journalists in New York that our meetings and conversations mean that we have recognized de facto the provisional Algerian Government"; and Khrushchev's own talks in New York with the Algerian representative Belkasim had "further strengthened the ties of friendship between our peoples". Kosygin wished "successes to the heroic Algerian people in their selfless struggle for their just cause and for freedom". In reply Ferhat Abbas observed that Kosygin had "officially confirmed the Soviet Government's de facto recognition of the provisional Government of the Algerian Republic" and had "assured us that you will give us aid and support". In New York Khrushchev had said that the Soviet Union would give "every possible aid which is available to us" to the Algerian people; "these words", said Ferhat Abbas, "constitute a step which will not fail to hasten the course of history, and we thank Premier Khrushchev for them".

African Students in the USSR

PRAVDA, TRUD AND KOMSOMOL'SKAYA PRAVDA of 7.8.60 carried reports of a meeting on 6.8.60 between students from Asian and African countries studying in Moscow and Soviet and foreign journalists. The meeting was organized by the Soviet Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee "at the request of the students" to rebut "the slanderous statements" of Stanley Omar

Okullo in the DAILY EXPRESS of 14.7.60. Okullo, a medical student from Uganda, who was said to have been expelled from the First Moscow Medical Institute for "lack of progress in his studies and amoral behaviour", was accused of having concealed the reasons for his expulsion and made completely unfounded charges about racialism in the Soviet Union, unsatisfactory material conditions for students and the fact that they all had to be "obedient tools of Kremlin policy". These lies had been seized on by certain organs of the American and, "a matter of particular regret", the African press. Individual students told how Okullo neglected his studies and got whisky from the British Embassy. They claimed that their material conditions were much better than in the West, that they were free agents and had many good Soviet friends. KOMSOMOL'SKAYA PRAVDA dealt particularly with Okullo's statement that his Somali friend had been beaten unconscious simply because he danced with a Russian girl. The truth however was that the Somali, who was drunk, spat in the girl's face when she excused herself from a waltz with him saying she had already promised the dance to someone else. She slapped his face, and a Soviet student intervened to protect the girl from the Somali's fists. Back in the students' hostel the Somali knocked another girl unconscious. KOMSOMOL'SKAYA PRAVDA excused Okullo from all the blame for his actions, alleging that he was the victim of the missionary activity of Edwin Morell, an American Mormon studying in the USSR under an exchange scheme. No facts were given to support this claim.

Soviet concern at reports of Afro-Asian students being isolated from the Soviet people was reflected in press reports on the Friendship University (see RUSSIA LOOKS AT AFRICA, page 13). IZVESTIYA of 5.8.60 said there was nothing in the charter of the University barring access to Soviet students. In an interview the Rector was quoted as saying that Soviet science and technology, being highly developed, needed to train specialists in very narrow fields, whereas the under-developed countries needed those with a more general training - the inference being presumably that it was rational to train the latter in a separate institute. However, a report in KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA of 9.9.60 announced that 60 Soviet students had already been selected to study in the Friendship University. PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA reported the opening of the University on 1.10.60 after those short-listed from the 35,000 applications for 500 places had undergone entrance examinations in Moscow in the second half of September, all expenses being paid.

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre
in association with
St. Antony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group